

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/247,054	Applicant(s) Antoniou et al.
	Examiner Anne-Marie Baker, Ph.D.	Group Art Unit 1632

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Anne-Marie Baker, Ph.D.

(3) _____

(2) Doreen Trujillo

(4) _____

Date of Interview Jun 5, 2001

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy is given to 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1-21, 23, and 25

Identification of prior art discussed:

Safaya et al. (1994) Blood 84(11): 3929-3935.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The Examiner stated that the remaining claims will be patentable over Safaya et al. (1994) with a few amendments to the claim language, given that the Safaya et al. reference is silent as to whether or not an HS2-linked gene would be expressed in a tissue-specific manner. The remaining claims now recite tissue-specific expression as a limitation. A few amendments to the claim language are required to bring Claims 12 and 14 into condition for allowance. Claim 12 recites only an "origin of replication" rather than a self-replicating origin of replication." This conflicts with the preamble which recites that the vectors are self-replicating episomal vectors. Claim 14 is still subject to a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as advanced in Paper No. 9. The Examiner will prepare an Examiner's Amendment incorporating the necessary changes and will fax it to facsimile no. (215)568-3439 for Applicants' consideration.

On June 12, 2001, the Examiner left a message for Doreen Trujillo asking if they are (see attached sheet)

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Art Unit: 1632

Interview Summary

(cont.) ready to authorize entry of the Examiner's Amendment. The Examiner also indicated that authorization to charge for a 1 month extension of time and a Deposit Account No. would be needed for entry of the Examiner's Amendment.